

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 1. Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the acrylic adhesive is a pressure-sensitive adhesive. Support for the amendment is immediately derived from the original application, in particular the Examples.

It is submitted that the amendments do not raise any new issues. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2 and 6-7 dependent thereon, are directed to an acrylic derived adhesive used for attachment of a polarizing plate. Independent claim 3, and claims 4, 5, and 8 dependent thereon are directed to an optical member.

As a preliminary, Applicants acknowledge the indication in the Office Action that claims 3-5 and 8 contain allowable subject matter. Since claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form, it is submitted that claims 3-5 and 8 are now immediately allowable.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by US 6,572,979 to Wollack et al. (Wollack'US) and under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by WO 99/43498 (Wollack'WO), the corresponding PCT publication.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. In the presently claimed invention, the acrylic adhesive is a pressure-sensitive adhesive as recited in present claim 1. In contrast, layer (b) of Wollack is completely different from the present acrylic pressure-sensitive adhesive, as discussed in the response to the previous Office Action, and Wollack is completely silent as to such a feature. Therefore, present claims 1-2 and 6 are not anticipated by, and not obvious over, the Wollack

references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 4,810,523 to Williams et al. (Williams). It is alleged in the Office Action that Williams discloses the subject matter of both claims 1 and 7, but the rejection is applied to claim 7 only in order to make the Office Action final.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. In Williams, a base polymer is manufactured by means of radiation polymerization (see Williams at col. 5, lines 43-46). In such case, there is no need for a polymerization initiator. Since, in addition, Williams is completely silent in this respect, a person of the art would infer that Williams does not use any polymerization initiator. Accordingly, the properties of the adhesive polymerized by radiation polymerization as in Williams cannot be compared to those of the base polymer used in the presently claimed invention. Specifically, the Examples of the present application illustrate that the low gel ratio property of the adhesive of the present invention, as recited in present claim 1, is appropriately obtained by using a polymerization initiator which is a non-peroxide initiator. This process is completely different from the radiation polymerized adhesive of Williams, and further, Williams provides no guidance regarding providing a low gel ratio property. Therefore, present claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by, and not obvious over, Williams.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020609
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 822-1100
Fax: (202) 822-1111
Customer No.: 38834
NES:rep